

REMARKS

This Amendment and Reply is intended to be completely responsive to the Final Office Action mailed January 19, 2010. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 18, 28 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 18-37 will remain pending in the present Application upon entry of this Amendment and Reply.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Specification

On page 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter relating to a second edge of the formed skin being positioned to extend past the second projection, as recited in Claims 20, 29 and 35. The Examiner alleged that there is no indication in either the drawings or the written description that a second edge of the formed skin is positioned to extend past the second projection. Applicants respectfully disagree, and direct the Examiner's attention to FIGURES 26-28 of the present Application. According to the embodiment illustrated, a second projection is shown as extending from a first mold section and being located between a first projection (that is associated with a first shut-off member) and a third projection (that is associated with a second shut-off member). From the FIGURES, it is clear that a second edge of the formed skin extends past the second projection toward the second mold section. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 3-7 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 18-20, 22 and 24-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002017360 to Hiraiwa et al. ("Hiraiwa et al.") in view of Japanese Application No. 2001-191361 to Mizuno

(“Mizuno”). On pages 7-9 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 21 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraiwa et al. and Mizuno, and in further view of Japanese Application No. 2002-187166 to Ae et al. (“Ae et al.”). On pages 10-11 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraiwa et al. and Mizuno, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,248,200 to Dailey et al. (“Dailey et al.”). These rejections should be withdrawn because Hiraiwa et al., alone or in any proper combination with Mizuno, Ae et al. and/or Dailey et al., fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed inventions as amended.

For example, independent Claim 18 (as amended) recites a “method of making a vehicle component” comprising, among other elements, “positioning a formed skin in the first cavity proximate the first mold section so that a first edge of the formed skin extends outward past the first projection toward the second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member. . . moving the first shut-off from the first position to the second position to provide a second cavity defined by a second portion of the first mold section, a second portion of the second mold section, the first edge of the formed skin that is extended past the first projection, the first resin, and the first shut-off member when in the second position, [and] injecting a second resin into the second cavity while the first edge of the formed skin remains extended past the first projection and bonding to the first resin and the first edge of the formed skin.”

Also, independent Claim 28 (as amended) recites a “method of making a vehicle component” comprising, among other elements, “positioning the formed skin in the first cavity proximate the first mold section between the first projection and the second projection so that the first edge of the formed skin extends outward past the first projection toward the second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member. . . moving the first shut-off member from the first position to the second position to provide a second cavity defined by a second portion of the first mold section, a second portion of the second mold section, the first edge of the formed skin that is extended past the first projection, the first resin, and the first shut-off member when in the second position, [and] injecting a second resin into the second

cavity while the first edge of the skin remains extended past the first projection and bonding to the first resin and the first edge of the formed skin.”

Further, independent Claim 35 (as amended) recites a “method of making a vehicle component” comprising, among other elements, “positioning the formed skin in the first cavity proximate the first mold section between the first projection and the second projection so that the first edge of the formed skin extends outward past the first projection toward the second mold section such that a free end of the first edge faces the first shut-off member and so that the second edge of the formed skin extends past the second projection . . . moving the first shut-off member from the first position to the second position to provide a second cavity defined by a second portion of the first mold section, a second portion of the second mold section, the first edge of the formed skin that is extended past the first projection, the first resin, and the first shut-off member when in the second position, [and] injecting a second resin into the second cavity while the first edge of the formed skin remains extended past the first projection and bonding to the first resin and the first edge of the formed skin.”

Hiraiwa et al., alone or in any proper combination with Mizuno, Ae et al. and/or Dailey et al., fails to disclose, teach or suggest such methods. In rejecting the claims, and in response to Applicants’ previous arguments, the Examiner alleged that Hiraiwa et al., in Figures 15-17, discloses alternative embodiments of a process in which a skin edge extends past a second projection 23. The Examiner also alleged that Mizuno, in Figure 9, discloses a formed skin that extends past a projection while resin is being added to a second cavity. Applicants have amended independent Claims 18, 28 and 35 to clarify the positioning of the first edge of the formed skin relative to the first projection, both before and during the time in which a second resin is injected. Support for this subject matter can be found, for example, in Figures 6-9 of the present Application. Neither Hiraiwa et al., Mizuno nor any of the other cited references (i.e., Ae et al. and Dailey et al.), discloses, teaches or suggests the positioning of a formed skin as now recited in independent Claims 18, 28 and 35. In contrast, both Hiraiwa et al. and Mizuno, in the Figures referenced by the Examiner, appear to disclose a skin that wraps around a projection, but that does not extend outward from the projection toward a shut-off member. Applicants submit that neither Ae et al. nor Dailey et al. correct this deficiency in Hiraiwa et al. and Mizuno.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 18, 28 and 35 because at least one element of such claim is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Hiraiwa et al., alone or in any proper combination with Mizuno, Ae et al. and/or Dailey et al. Applicants submit that Claims 19-27, as they depend from Claim 18, Claims 29-34, as they depend from Claim 28, and Claims 36 and 37, as they depend from Claim 35, are allowable therewith at least because of their dependency, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 18-37 is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claims 18-37 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over Claims 38-62 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/569,225 in combination with Hiraiwa et al., Mizuno and/or Dailey et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner has acknowledged that the '225 application does not claim a formed skin. As stated above, neither Hiraiwa et al., Mizuno nor Dailey et al., alone or in any proper combination, disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of a formed skin that is extended outward past the first projection as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the provisional double patenting rejection.

In the alternative, Applicants note that the present Application and copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/569,225 are commonly owned. While Applicants do not acquiesce with the provisional double patenting rejection, Applicants request that the provisional double patenting rejection of Claims 18-37 over Claims 38-62 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/569,225 be held in abeyance at this time (since a timely filed terminal disclaimer would overcome the rejection such that further consideration of the claims on that rejection should not be necessary). 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b).

* * *

Applicants believe that the present Application is now in condition for allowance. In particular, even when the elements of Applicants' claims, as discussed above, are given a broad

construction and interpreted to cover equivalents, the cited references do not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Favorable reconsideration of the present Application as amended is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants respectfully put the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5/18/2010

By /Adam M. Gustafson/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (414) 297-5652
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Adam M. Gustafson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,601